arXiv:1603.07539v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 24 Mar 2016

Cooperative strings in glassy nanoparticles

Maxence Arutkin,[1] Elie Raphaël,[1] James A. Forrest,[1, 2, 3] and Thomas Salez[1, 2, 4, *]

[1] *Laboratoire de Physico-Chimie Théorique, UMR CNRS Gulliver 7083, ESPCI ParisTech, PSL Research University, 75005 Paris, France.*
[2] *Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 2Y5, Canada.*
[3] *Department of Physics & Astronomy and Guelph-Waterloo Physics Institute, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada.*
[4] *Global Station for Soft Matter, Global Institution for Collaborative Research and Education, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Hokkaido 060-0808, Japan.*

(Dated: March 25, 2016)

Motivated by recent experimental results on glassy polymer nanoparticles, we develop a first theoretical framework for the glass transition in spherical confinement. This is accomplished using our cooperative-string model for supercooled dynamics, that was successful at recovering the bulk phenomenology and describing the thin-film anomalies. In particular, we obtain predictions for the mobile-layer thickness as a function of temperature, and for the effective glass-transition temperature as a function of the radius of the spherical nanoparticle. Finally, we compare the theoretical results to experimental data on polystyrene from the recent literature, and we discuss the latter.

INTRODUCTION

As a significant part of the ongoing research towards the understanding of the glass transition [1–6], the past two decades have seen significant interest in the anomalous dynamics of thin glass-forming polymer films [7, 8]. In particular, the observed reductions of the glass-transition temperature in thin polymer films [9–13] have been suggested to be either strongly influenced or caused by the enhanced dynamics in the free-surface region [14–18], and have triggered an intense theoretical activity [19–30]. Similarly, the effect of interfaces is expected to manifest in other geometries [31]. The simplest such case is that of polymer spherical nanoparticles [32–39], and their recent colloidal analogues [40].

To our knowledge, the first report of anomalous dynamics in polymer nanoparticles is that of Sasaki *et al.* [32]. In that work, differential scanning calorimetry of aqueous dispersions of polystyrene nanospheres in the 21-274 nm radius range showed no evidence for a reduced glass-transition temperature, but instead found a radius-dependent value of the step in heat capacity at the glass transition. Analysis of the data suggested that this result is consistent with a near-surface region of size $\sim$ 3.8 nm not contributing to the transition. Then, Rharby used neutron scattering to measure mechanical deformations of polystyrene nanospheres individually dispersed in crosslinked polybuthylmethacrylate matrices, and deduced glass-transition temperatures that were reduced from the bulk value for nanospheres less than $\sim$ 30 nm in radius [33]. Later measurements by Zhang *et al.* [36], and Feng *et al.* [38], showed reductions in the glass-transition temperature for spheres of larger radii, and with a strong dependence on the sphere coating. The latter fact is reminiscent of the strong effect even small amounts of residual surfactants can have on thin-film reductions in the glass-transition temperature, as reported by Chen and Torkelson [41]. The above large disparity in observations may partially result from the much more difficult sample preparation in making dispersed nanospheres, as compared to thin films. Indeed, the presence of surfactants and/or residual monomers, and the uncertainty in final molecular weight could result in large variations between different experiments. As a consequence, it appears necessary to establish a first theoretical framework for the description of the glass transition in spherical confinement, and by this to enable comparisons between the observations in thin films and nanoparticles.

In this article, we utilise the cooperative-string model [30] – recently developed and successfully applied to thin glassy films – for the present case of glassy nanoparticles. After recalling the main ingredients of the bulk description, we turn to its modification in spherical geometry and discuss the implications for experiments. In particular, we characterize the extent of the mobile-layer region as a function of temperature, and we describe the glass-transition temperature reductions as a function of particle radius, providing predictions for experiments. One purpose of this work is that it allows a natural separation between the effects intrinsic to glass formation, and those related to the polymeric nature of the materials for which even the thin-film geometry [12] has so far defied a proper theoretical description, despite promising ideas [42, 43].

COOPERATIVE-STRING MODEL

In a supercooled liquid, due to crowding and caging [44], local rearrangements seem to require the cooperative participation of a growing number of molecules as the temperature T is decreased [45, 46]. This was related through phenomenological arguments [47, 48] to the

vanishing of the free volume [49] needed for relaxation, and could lead to the tremendous slowing down of glassy dynamics described by the empirical time-temperature superposition [50–53]. This relaxation process defines a temperature-dependent length scale $\xi(T)$ for the cooperatively rearranging regions, and thus for glassy dynamics in the bulk [54, 55]. Furthermore, numerical simulations [56–58], and experiments [35, 59], suggested that those regions take the form of chains – the so-called *cooperative strings*. In a recent article [30], we developed a minimal kinetic model based on those ideas, that was successful in reproducing bulk phenomenology and in describing thin-film anomalies. Below, we reproduce the main ingredients of the model for a bulk supercooled liquid.

Let us consider a dense assembly of small molecules with size $\lambda_{\rm V}$ and average intermolecular distance λ. The volume fraction is thus $\phi \propto (\lambda_{\rm V}/\lambda)^3$. A test molecule sits in a cage of volume $\sim \lambda^3$, with gates of length $L \sim \lambda - \lambda_{\rm V}$. We set that a typical non-cooperative liquid-like local relaxation requires $L > L_{\rm c} = \lambda_{\rm c} - \lambda_{\rm V}$, or equivalently λ to be larger than $\lambda_{\rm c}$ – the so-called onset of cooperativity, with volume fraction $\phi_{\rm c}$. Also, when $\lambda \sim \lambda_{\rm V}$, the gates are completely closed ($L \sim 0$) and the system is at kinetic arrest, with volume fraction $\phi_{\rm V}$. For $\lambda_{\rm V} < \lambda < \lambda_{\rm c}$, the relaxation is possible but necessarily collective. It requires a random string-like cooperative motion involving at least $N^* - 1$ neighbours of the test molecule, that provide a total space $(N^* - 1)L \sim L_{\rm c} - L$ by getting in close contact with each other. The test molecule thus sees a temporary larger gate, of length $L_{\rm c}$, and can exit the cage. Therefore, one gets the scaling expression of the minimal number of molecules needed for a local relaxation, *i. e.* the so-called cooperativity:

$$N^*(\phi) = \frac{\left(\frac{\phi_{\rm V}}{\phi_{\rm c}}\right)^{1/3} - 1}{\left(\frac{\phi_{\rm V}}{\phi}\right)^{1/3} - 1} \ . \tag{1}$$

As expected, this expression reaches 1 at the cooperative onset $\phi_{\rm c}$, where solitary rearrangements are allowed, and diverges at the kinetic arrest point $\phi_{\rm V}$. Note that the bulk glass-transition point $\phi_{\rm g}^{\rm bulk}$ lies somewhere in between those two extreme values.

By introducing the necessity of coherence between molecular motions within a cooperative rearrangement, one can show that in a typical cooperative string made of N^* molecules, the relaxation rate τ^{-1} follows:

$$\frac{\tau_0}{\tau} = \left(\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_{\rm c}}\right)^{N^*} \ , \tag{2}$$

where $\tau_{\rm c} \sim 1$ μs is a typical liquid-like relaxation time at the cooperative onset, and $\tau_0 \sim 1$ ps is a molecular time scale. Note that we thus recover the Adam-Gibbs phenomenology [46]. Since, in the temperature range considered, the thermal expansion coefficient $\alpha = -(1/\phi){\rm d}\phi/{\rm d}T$ of the supercooled liquid is almost constant, one has:



FIG. 1: *Two string-like cooperative paths in a supercooled spherical nanoparticle of radius R. Relaxation of a test molecule (green) at a distance r from the sphere center can occur through either a bulk cooperative string (blue) of size ξ (Eq. (6)), or a truncated string (red) touching the interface.*

$$\phi(T) = \phi_{\rm V}[1 - \alpha(T - T_{\rm V})] \ , \tag{3}$$

where $\phi(T_{\rm V}) = \phi_{\rm V}$ defines the Vogel temperature $T_{\rm V}$. Therefore, our description naturally leads to the Vogel-Fulcher-Tammann time-temperature superposition [50–52] without incorporation of any enthalpic contribution, through the use of Eqs. (1), (2) and (3):

$$\tau(T) = \tau_0 \exp\left(\frac{A}{T - T_{\rm V}}\right) \ , \tag{4}$$

where $A = (T_{\rm c} - T_{\rm V})\ln(\tau_{\rm c}/\tau_0)$, and with $\phi(T_{\rm c}) = \phi_{\rm c}$ by definition of the onset temperature $T_{\rm c}$.

As the bulk relaxation process presented here consists of random cooperative strings involving N^* molecules, one can describe them through ideal random walks, and the length scale ξ of the cooperatively rearranging regions is thus of the form $\xi \sim \lambda\sqrt{N^*}$, near the kinetic arrest point. We note that a more realistic self-avoiding walk would give an exponent ~ 0.6 instead of $1/2$. Invoking Eqs. (1) and (3), one obtains the temperature-dependent expression of the cooperativity:

$$N^*(T) = \frac{T_{\rm c} - T_{\rm V}}{T - T_{\rm V}} \ , \tag{5}$$

and thus the asymptotic expression for the associated length scale:

$$\xi(T) = \lambda_{\rm V}\sqrt{\frac{T_{\rm c} - T_{\rm V}}{T - T_{\rm V}}} \ . \tag{6}$$

As a consequence, the cooperative length diverges at the Vogel temperature with a $-1/2$ power law, and is comparable to the molecular diameter at the cooperative onset.

SPHERICAL CONFINEMENT

Within the context of the cooperative-string model summarized above, we now investigate the effect of confinement – a situation that arises when the system size becomes comparable to the bulk cooperative length ξ. More precisely, inspired by recent experimental results [32–39], we consider spherical nanoparticles of radius R. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the interface is a reservoir of free volume and as such it truncates the cooperative strings, leading to a higher local mobility. We therefore introduce the average local cooperativity $N_{\rm s}^*(r,R,T)$, at a distance r from the center of the sphere, and at temperature T. Intuitively, if $R-r$ is much larger than ξ, the interface is typically not reached with less than N^* cooperative molecules. In contrast, when $R-r$ becomes comparable to ξ, the cooperative strings start to feel the interface, and the effective number of cooperative molecules needed for relaxation is reduced. Lastly, as r approaches R, we expect $N_{\rm s}^*$ to vanish and the relaxation to be purely liquid-like.

Because our minimal description of the local relaxation process relies on random cooperative strings involving N^* molecules, we can use a first-passage argument in the limit of large N^*, in order to determine $N_{\rm s}^*$. For that purpose, we define n_0 as the number of molecular units at which a given realization of a random string reaches the interface for the first "time". If $n_0 \geq N^*$, the string is bulk-like; if $n_0 < N^*$, the string is truncated by the interface. Therefore, the important quantity here is the density of probability $g(t)$ of the first-passage "time" $t = n_0/N^*$ at the interface, located at dimensionless radial position R/ξ, of a 3D Brownian process starting at dimensionless radial position r/ξ, with $r < R$. Below, we briefly summarise the main mathematical steps allowing to obtain $g(t)$ explicitly. The Laplace transform of $g(t)$ can be written as [60, 61]:

$$\hat{g}(p) = \frac{R}{r}\frac{\sinh\left(\frac{r\sqrt{2p}}{\xi}\right)}{\sinh\left(\frac{R\sqrt{2p}}{\xi}\right)} \ . \tag{7}$$

By using the Bromwich integral [62], one can invert the Laplace transform through:

$$g(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-i\infty}^{+i\infty} {\rm d}p\, \hat{g}(p)\exp(pt) \tag{8}$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \underset{p=p_n}{\rm Res}\left[\hat{g}(p)\exp(pt)\right] \ , \tag{9}$$

where $\underset{p=p_n}{\rm Res}\left[\hat{g}(p)\exp(pt)\right]$ is the residue of the function $\hat{g}(p)\exp(pt)$ around the pole:

$$p_n = -n^2\frac{\pi^2\xi^2}{2R^2} \ , \tag{10}$$

with n a strictly positive integer. Note that if the numerator of the right-hand side of Eq. (7) vanishes at a given p_n, the latter is actually not a pole of $\hat{g}(p)$, and the corresponding residue equals zero which preserves the validity of Eq. (9). Using l'Hôpital's rule, Eq. (9) can be further reformulated into the series:

$$g(t) = \frac{1}{uv^2}\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}(-1)^{n-1}\sin(ua_n)\,a_n\exp\left(-\frac{a_n^2 t}{2v^2}\right) \ , \tag{11}$$

where we introduced $a_n = n\pi$, $u = r/R$, and $v = R/\xi$, for clarity.

Knowing the first-passage density $g(t)$, one can now compute the average local cooperativity $N_{\rm s}^*$ by averaging the minimum between N^* and n_0:

$$N_{\rm s}^*(r,R,T) = N^*(T)\,\langle\min(1,t)\rangle_t \tag{12}$$

$$= N^*(T)\,f\left(\frac{r}{R},\frac{R}{\xi(T)}\right) \ , \tag{13}$$

where $\langle ...\rangle_t$ indicates the average over all first-passage times. In the last equation, we introduced the truncation factor:

$$f(u,v) = 1 - \int_0^1 {\rm d}t\,(1-t)\,g(t) \tag{14}$$

$$= 4\frac{v^2}{u}\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}\frac{(-1)^{n-1}\sin(ua_n)}{a_n^3}\left[1-\exp\left(-\frac{a_n^2}{2v^2}\right)\right] \ , \tag{15}$$

that takes values in the interval $[0,1]$, and which depends on the nanoparticle radius R, the radial location r of the test molecule, and the bulk cooperative length ξ.



FIG. 2: *Predicted surface mobile-layer thicknesses h_m of spherical polystyrene nanoparticles as a function of temperature T, according to Eqs. (15) and (16), for different sphere radii as indicated. We used the bulk glass-transition temperature $T_g^{bulk} = 371$ K [63], and the onset temperature $T_c = 463$ K [54, 64]. We fixed the molecular diameter $\lambda_V = 3.7$ nm, and the Vogel temperature $T_V = 322$ K, to the values previously obtained for the thin-film geometry [30]. Note that we replaced the $+\infty$ bound by 25 in Eq. (15), and checked that it provides sufficiently precise numerical estimates. For comparison, the dashed line indicates the flat-interface result used for the thin-film geometry [30].*

DISCUSSION

Using the results of the previous section, one can now quantify the thickness of the mobile layer near the surface of a nanoparticle. Let us consider a temperature T below the bulk glass-transition temperature $T_{\rm g}^{\rm bulk}$. At the interface, the relaxation is non-cooperative or liquid-like; in contrast, deep inside the sphere the relaxation is bulk-like and the sample exhibits glassy dynamics. Therefore, there must exist a distance $h_{\rm m}$ from the interface, at which the local cooperativity $N_{\rm s}^*(R-h_{\rm m},R,T)$ equals the bulk cooperativity at the bulk glass transition $N^*\left(T_{\rm g}^{\rm bulk}\right)$. Invoking Eqs. (5), (6), and (13), one obtains:

$$f\left(\frac{R-h_{\rm m}}{R},\frac{R}{\lambda_{\rm V}}\sqrt{\frac{T-T_{\rm V}}{T_{\rm c}-T_{\rm V}}}\right) \;=\; \frac{T-T_{\rm V}}{T_{\rm g}^{\rm bulk}-T_{\rm V}}\;, \quad (16)$$

which implicitly defines the temperature-dependent mobile-layer thickness $h_{\rm m}(T)$. The latter is plotted in Fig. 2 for several sphere radii, and with the relevant parameters for polystyrene [30, 54, 63, 64]. A number of observations can be made. First, as expected, the curves converge at large R to the flat-interface result used for the thin-film geometry [30]. Secondly, $h_{\rm m}$ is an increasing function of temperature, bounded by the system size R. In all cases, at the bulk glass-transition temperature $T_{\rm g}^{\rm bulk}$, *i. e.* when all the material is liquid, $h_{\rm m}$ equals the system size. Thirdly, below $T_{\rm g}^{\rm bulk}$, $h_{\rm m}$ is typically of the order of a few nanometers, consistent with the ~ 3.8 nm estimate of Sasaki *et al.* for polystyrene nanospheres [32], as well as with several experimental observations on thin polystyrene films [14–18]. Finally, near the Vogel temperature $T_{\rm V}$, $h_{\rm m}$ saturates to a finite value that can be calculated explicitly since the cooperativity N^* becomes very large (see Eq. (5)) and thus the typical values of $t=n_0/N^*$ are much lower than 1. In that case, $f=\langle\min(1,t)\rangle_t\simeq\langle t\rangle_t=-\hat{g}'(0)=(R^2-r^2)/(3\xi^2)$, according to Eq. (7). Using this approximation, as well as Eqs. (6) and (16), one obtains the limiting value:

$$\frac{h_{\rm m}(T_{\rm V})}{R}=1-\sqrt{1-\left(\frac{R_{\rm min}}{R}\right)^2}\;, \quad (17)$$

where $R_{\rm min}=\sqrt{3}\,\xi(T_{\rm g}^{\rm bulk})\approx 10$ nm, with the parameters relevant to polystyrene [30, 54, 63, 64]. Practically, this result implies that a polystyrene nanoparticle with a nearly-free interface and a radius below ~ 10 nm remains liquid at all temperatures, thus revealing important constraints for potential applications. Fundamentally, the idea of a confinement-induced melting of a glass [31] for a system size comparable to the bulk cooperative length $\xi(T_{\rm g}^{\rm bulk})$ at the bulk glass transition appears to be relevant. As a last remark, note that as R diverges, $h_{\rm m}(T_{\rm V})$ vanishes, as in the flat-interface result used for the thin-film geometry [30].



FIG. 3: *Comparison between experimental data (symbols) for the reduced glass-transition temperature $\mathcal{T}_g(R)$ of spherical polystyrene nanoparticles [33, 35, 38] of radius R, and the theory (line) given by Eq. (18) – that invokes Eq. (15) through $\mathcal{F}(v)=f(2^{-1/3},v)$. The fixed parameters are the bulk glass-transition temperature $T_g^{bulk}=371$ K [63], and the onset temperature $T_c=463$ K [54, 64]. The two adjustable parameters are the molecular diameter $\lambda_V=3.7$ nm, and the Vogel temperature $T_V=322$ K, that were fixed to the values previously obtained for the thin-film geometry [30]. Note that we replaced the $+\infty$ bound by 25 in Eq. (15), and checked that it provides sufficiently precise numerical estimates.*

We can now determine the effective glass-transition temperature $\mathcal{T}_{\rm g}(R)$ measured in nanoparticles of radius R, by using the following criterion [26, 28]: the transition occurs when half of the sample volume is liquid and the other half is glassy, *i.e.* $(R-h_{\rm m})/R=2^{-1/3}$ for a sphere. Introducing $\mathcal{F}(v)=f\left(2^{-1/3},v\right)$, and using Eq. (16), we get:

$$R\left(\mathcal{T}_{\rm g}\right)=\lambda_{\rm V}\sqrt{\frac{T_{\rm c}-T_{\rm V}}{\mathcal{T}_{\rm g}-T_{\rm V}}}\,\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\frac{\mathcal{T}_{\rm g}-T_{\rm V}}{T_{\rm g}^{\rm bulk}-T_{\rm V}}\right)\;, \quad (18)$$

which implicitly defines $\mathcal{T}_{\rm g}(R)$. The latter is plotted in Fig. 3, with the relevant parameters for polystyrene [30, 54, 63, 64], and it is compared to experimental results from the literature [33, 35, 38]. Two things become immediately obvious. On one hand, it is clear and encouraging that both the model and the data show reductions in the glass-transition temperature for spherical polystyrene nanoparticles with a radius of a few tens of nanometers. On the other hand, making more detailed comparisons is simply not possible due to large scatter in the experimental data.

At this point, it is important to make a few remarks. First, if we shift vertically the data of Zhang *et al.* [35], in order to enforce equal $T_{\rm g}^{\rm bulk}$ values between all studies, the general agreement to literature data becomes comparable to the thin-film case [30]. Secondly, the presence of residual surfactants – a necessary ingredient in many nanosphere preparation techniques – has been

shown to have a large effect on the magnitude of the glass-transition temperature reductions in thin films [41], and could thus be responsible for part of the experimental scatter. Thirdly, spherical polymer nanoparticles may well be like freestanding films, in that no part of the sample is on a substrate. It is thus fruitful here to remember the case of freestanding polystyrene thin films [12]. In those samples, two different types of behaviour were observed: i) for low molecular weights, there are reductions in the glass-transition temperature that do not depend on the molecular weight, and which are similar to the ones in supported films – well captured by our cooperative-string model [30]; ii) in contrast, for large molecular weights, the reductions in the glass-transition temperature are much more pronounced, and exhibit a dependence with molecular weight, suggesting another – polymeric – relaxation mode [42, 43], still to be described theoretically in quantitative details.

To conclude, in view of the robustness of our cooperative-string model for bulk samples and supported films [30], and given the present results and discussion, this work could be set as a first theoretical framework for describing the glassy dynamics in surfactant-free monodisperse low-molecular-weight spherical nanoparticles. Beyond the radius-dependent reduction in the glass-transition temperature, the model offers a preliminary prediction on the surface mobile-layer thickness as a function of temperature, and sets the existence of a minimal sphere radius of order $\sim$ 10 nm, below which vitrification never occurs. As such, our results reveal important constraints on potential applications, and may serve as a guiding tool for future fundamental studies around the glass transition, in confinement, and at interfaces.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Raphaël Voituriez, Justin Salez, Kari Dalnoki-Veress, Ulysse Mizrahi, and Nathan Israeloff for interesting discussions. They acknowledge financial support from the ESPCI Paris Sciences Chair, the Global Station for Soft Matter – a project of Global Institution for Collaborative Research and Education at Hokkaido University – and the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through Industry Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Economic Development & Innovation.

* Corresponding author: thomas.salez@espci.fr

[1] P. W. Anderson, Science **267**, 1615 (1995).
[2] G. Parisi and F. Zamponi, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 789 (2010).
[3] A. J. Liu and S. R. Nagel, Annu. Rev. Cond. Mat. Phys. **1** (2010).
[4] L. Berthier, G. Biroli, J.-P. Bouchaud, L. Cipeletti, and W. van Saarloos, eds., *Dynamical heterogeneities in glasses, colloids, and granular media* (Oxford University Press, 2010).
[5] L. Berthier and G. Biroli, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 587 (2011).
[6] M. D. Ediger and P. Harrowell, The Journal of Chemical Physics p. 137 (2012).
[7] G. McKenna, The European Physical Journal E: Soft Matter and Biological Physics **12**, 191 (2003).
[8] M. D. Ediger and J. A. Forrest, Macromolecules **47**, 471 (2014).
[9] J. L. Keddie, R. A. L. Jones, and R. A. Cory, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **27**, 59 (1994).
[10] J. A. Forrest, K. Dalnoki-Veress, J. R. Stevens, and J. R. Dutcher, Physical Review Letters **77**, 2002 (1996).
[11] C. J. Ellison and J. M. Torkelson, Nature Materials **2**, 695 (2003).
[12] Dalnoki-Veress, K., Forrest, J. A., de Gennes, P. G., and Dutcher, J. R., J. Phys. IV France **10**, Pr7 (2000).
[13] O. Bäumchen, J. D. McGraw, J. A. Forrest, and K. Dalnoki-Veress, Physical Review Letters **109**, 055701 (2012).
[14] Z. Fakhraai and J. A. Forrest, Science **319**, 600 (2008).
[15] M. Ilton, D. Qi, and J. A. Forrest, Macromolecules **42**, 6851 (2009).
[16] Z. Yang, Y. Fujii, F. K. Lee, C.-H. Lam, and O. K. C. Tsui, Science **328**, 1676 (2010).
[17] Y. Chai, T. Salez, J. D. McGraw, M. Benzaquen, K. Dalnoki-Veress, E. Raphaël, and J. A. Forrest, Science **343**, 994 (2014).
[18] W. Zhang and L. Yu, Macromolecules **49**, 731 (2016).
[19] K. Ngai, A. Rizos, and D. Plazek, Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids **235-237**, 435 (1998).
[20] P. Scheidler, W. Kob, and K. Binder, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **52**, 277 (2000).
[21] D. Long and F. Lequeux, European Physical Journal E **4**, 371 (2001).
[22] S. Herminghaus, K. Jacobs, and R. Seemann, European Physical Journal E **5**, 531 (2001).
[23] F. Varnik, J. Baschnagel, and K. Binder, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 021507 (2002).
[24] J. Baschnagel and F. Varnik, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **17**, R851 (2005).
[25] J. E. G. Lipson and S. T. Milner, European Physical Journal B **72**, 133 (2009).
[26] J. A. Forrest, The Journal of Chemical Physics **139**, 084702 (2013).
[27] C.-H. Lam and O. K. C. Tsui, Phys. Rev. E **88**, 042604 (2013).
[28] J. A. Forrest and K. Dalnoki-Veress, ACS Macro Letters **3**, 310 (2014).
[29] S. Mirigian and K. S. Schweizer, The Journal of Chemical Physics **141**, 161103 (2014).
[30] T. Salez, J. Salez, K. Dalnoki-Veress, E. Raphaël, and J. A. Forrest, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA **112**, 8227 (2015).
[31] C. L. Jackson and G. B. McKenna, The Journal of Chemical Physics **93**, 9002 (1990).
[32] T. Sasaki, A. Shimizu, T. H. Mourey, C. T. Thurau, and M. D. Ediger, The Journal of Chemical Physics **119**, 8730 (2003).

[33] Y. Rharbi, Phys. Rev. E **77**, 031806 (2008).
[34] Y. Guo, C. Zhang, C. Lai, R. D. Priestley, M. D'Acunzi, and G. Fytas, ACS Nano **5**, 5365 (2011).
[35] C. Zhang, Y. Guo, and R. D. Priestley, Macromolecules **44**, 4001 (2011).
[36] C. Zhang, Y. Guo, K. B. Shepard, and R. D. Priestley, The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters **4**, 431 (2013).
[37] C. Zhang, V. M. Boucher, D. Cangialosi, and R. D. Priestley, Polymer **54**, 230 (2013).
[38] S. Feng, Z. Y. Li, R. Liu, B. Y. Mai, Q. Wu, G. D. Liang, H. Y. Gaoab, and F. M. Zhu, Soft Matter **9**, 4614 (2013).
[39] S. Feng, Y. Chen, B. Mai, W. Wei, C. Zheng, Q. Wu, G. D. Liang, H. Y. Gaoab, and F. M. Zhu, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **16**, 15941 (2014).
[40] B. Zhang and X. Cheng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 098302 (2016).
[41] L. Chen and J. M. Torkelson, Polymer **86**, 226 (2016).
[42] P. de Gennes, The European Physical Journal E **2**, 201 (2000), ISSN 1292-8941.
[43] S. T. Milner and J. E. G. Lipson, Macromolecules **9865**, 43 (2010).
[44] W. Götze, Condensed Matter Physics **1**, 873 (1998).
[45] J. H. Gibbs and E. A. DiMarzio, The Journal of Chemical Physics **28**, 373 (1958).
[46] G. Adam and J. H. Gibbs, The Journal of Chemical Physics **43**, 139 (1965).
[47] A. K. Doolittle, Journal of Applied Physics **22**, 1471 (1951).
[48] S. F. Edwards and T. Vilgis, Physica Scripta **T13**, 7 (1986).
[49] M. H. Cohen and G. S. Grest, Phys. Rev. B **20**, 1077 (1979).
[50] H. Vogel, Physikalische Zeitschrift **22**, 645 (1921).
[51] G. S. Fulcher, Journal of the American Ceramic Society **8**, 339 (1925).
[52] G. Tammann and W. Hesse, Zeitschrift fr Anorganische und Allgemeine Chemie **156**, 245 (1926).
[53] M. L. Williams, R. F. Landel, and J. D. Ferry, Journal of the American Chemical Society **77**, 3701 (1955).
[54] E. Donth, Journal of Polymer Science: Part B: Polymer Physics **34**, 2881 (1996).
[55] J. D. Stevenson, J. Schmalian, and P. G. Wolynes, Nature Physics **2**, 268 (2006).
[56] C. Donati, J. F. Douglas, W. Kob, S. J. Plimpton, P. H. Poole, and S. C. Glotzer, Physical review letters **80**, 2338 (1998).
[57] P. Pal, C. S. O'Hern, J. Blawzdziewicz, E. R. Dufresne, and R. Stinchcombe, Physical Review E **78**, 011111 (2008).
[58] B. A. Pazmino Betancourt, J. F. Douglas, and F. W. Starr, The Journal of Chemical Physics **140**, 204509 (2014).
[59] A. S. Keys, A. R. Abate, S. C. Glotzer, and D. J. Durian, Nature Physics **3**, 260 (2007).
[60] S. Redner, *A guide to first-passage processes* (Cambridge University Press, 2001).
[61] J. Kent, The Annals of Probability p. 760 (1978).
[62] G. Arfken, *Inverse Laplace Transformation, in Mathematical Methods for Physicists* (Academic Press, Orlando, FL, 1985).
[63] M. Rubinstein and R. H. Colby, *Polymer Physics* (Oxford University Press, 2003).
[64] S. Kahle, J. Korus, E. Hempel, R. Unger, S. Höring, K. Schrötter, and E. Donth, Macromolecules **30**, 7214 (1997).